Ham-Policy Digest   Sun, 24 Apr 94   Volume 94 : Issue 182

Today's Topics:
                      /AA? (I'm confused)
              Another Vanity Call Question (2 msgs)
             rec.radio.amateur.vhf.plus (?) (2 msgs)
               Upgraded license expiration question
                      Vanity Callsign Question

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 22 Apr 1994 22:27:54 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!
crcnis1.unl.edu!docman.doc.state.ne.us!hannibal!mcduffie@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: /AA? (I'm confused)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jim Hollenback (jholly@cup.hp.com) wrote:
: Jerry Dallal (jerry@hnrc.tufts.edu) wrote:

: :   My confusion arises becase the FCC does not   require a
: :   change of call signs. Does this mean that if N0NNN were to go
: :   from Technician to Advanced without requesting a change in
: :   call sign, (s)he would be required to use N0NNN/AA while the
: :   upgrade was being processed but could go back to plain old
: :   N0NNN once the new license was received!!!???

: :   Thanks.

: Yes. During the interim period the FCC database does not show the correct
: license class, hence the need for the /AA. Once the license is issued
: the database is correct and hence, no need for the /AA.

Not so...unless N0NNN is actually using the new privileges. As long as
he/she is using only the old privileges, he/she doesn't need the /AA. It
is there to indicate that the license is in the process of undergoing a
change and what that change is.

Gary

Date: 23 Apr 94 15:29:49 GMT
From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Another Vanity Call Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michael Silva (mjsilva@ted.win.net) wrote:
: Being happy with my call, and having a new box of QSLs on the shelf, I
: haven't followed the vanity proposal closely, but I do have one
: question: Will Novices, Techs, etc be able to get 1x2 and 2x1 calls?
: I know they will be behind other groups in being allowed to submit
: their requests, but is there anything in the proposal that limits the
: calls a given class may request?

: Mike, KK6GM
:

Proposed 97.19 (g): "Each vanity call sign requested must be selected
from the groups of call signs designated under the sequential call
sign system for the class of operator licence held by the applicant or
for a lower class."

"well, there 'tis ..."

-drt

|David R. Tucker   KG2S   8P9CL   drt@world.std.com|

Date: 22 Apr 94 13:18:27 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!gatech!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!news1.oakland.edu!vela.acs.oakland.edu!
prvalko@ucbvax.berkeley.edu

Subject: Another Vanity Call Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

The way I read it, you are limited to calls you qualify for. An extra
could ask for anything, while a novice would be limited to a 2x3.

paul wb8zjl

Date: 23 Apr 94 20:45:28 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!ccnet.com!ccnet.com!not-for-
mail@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: rec.radio.amateur.vhf.plus (?)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Paul Flaherty (paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU) wrote:

: I'll see if I can come up with some sort of automated listserver this
: weekend, and set it up. If folks really want to set up a newsgroup, that's
: okay too; I probably won't tie the two together.

Please post to the newsgroups when you get this going.   Thanks

--
    Bob Wilkins   work   bwilkins@cave.org
 Berkeley, California   home   rwilkins@ccnet.com
    94701-0710   play   n6fri@n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.noam

Date: 22 Apr 1994 11:57:58 -0700
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!crash!news.sprintlink.net!connected.com!connected.com!
not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: rec.radio.amateur.vhf.plus (?)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

     rec.radio.amateur.vhf.plus should it be created?

This is a informal request to see if there is enough interest to warrant a
new news group. The driving factors in this interest are, the apparent
demise of the vhf list run out of Stanford University and the lack of any
other news group for this area. The major unknown is if there is enough
interest to set up a formal RFD/CFV for this area.

While my primary interest is in the weak signal area, I have also noticed
a general need in areas of ATV, Repeaters, FM, etc. So I envision the

charter as being read very broadly, to include all areas of VHF/UHF/SHF
interest, except RC, satellite, and packet (as they have their own forums)

Please reply to me via email or to rec.radio.amateur.misc (also posted to
rec.radio.amateur.space and rec.radio.amateur.policy)

Ralph Lindberg N7BSN member ARRL, AMSAT,CS-VHF,MW-Microwave, Kistap ARES
email =>dragonsl@hebron.connected.com

Date: 23 Apr 94 22:18:41 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!blanket.mitre.org!world!drt@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Upgraded license expiration question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Bruce Lifter (bal@ccd.harris.com) wrote:

:   A person takes an examination and upgrades their license. The
:   person wants a new call sign so they check the box on the 610 form
:   requesting a new call.

:   It is my understanding (provided that the person already has a license)
:   that the person can operate with their old call sign for a period time
:   (365 days?) with their new privileges.

That "instant upgrade" thing is only good for an application the FCC
has not yet acted upon. 97.9b.

:   When the new call comes in the
:   mail, the person is supposed to quit using the old call and use the
:   new call.

:   But what if for some reason they don't care for the new call?
:   Can they continue to use the old call and in the mean time apply for a
:   new call? If they do, is this illegal? If illegal, when does the old call
:   expire?.. At the date of issue by the FCC?... At the time that the
:   person signs the new license?

As soon as you get your license in the mail, I guess - you know then
that the application has been acted upon (and granted - remember, you
asked for it! Well, sort of). Certainly when you sign it.

Thinking of getting around this by claiming the post office ate your
mail? How, then, are you going to include a photocopy of your new
license when you request a *new* call (and whyever would you want one
if you'd never seen the old call)?

-drt

```
-----------------------------------------------------------------------
|David R. Tucker    KG2S            8P9CL            drt@world.std.com|
-----------------------------------------------------------------------
```

Date: 21 Apr 1994 18:27:53 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!news1.oakland.edu!
vela.acs.oakland.edu!prvalko@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Vanity Callsign Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Bob Levine (levine@mc.com) wrote:
: Has anyone seen or read anything in the vanity callsign
: proposal that would exclude people from requesting vanity
: calls from another district? I am in 1 land, but maybe
: I would like to have K0OL for example?

Hahaha! stand in line, Bob. We had quite an interesting discussion on
this topic a couple days ago. The proposal is to limit district
designators ("numbers," for those of you in Rio Linda), to people IN
those districts.

Not a problem though, there are TWO guys on one of my favorite local
repeaters that have calls (2 by 1's) from the "3" district, as our own
"8" district had run out of them. Just get a PO box or have the ticket
mailed to a friend's address.

73 =paul= wb8zjl

Date: 24 Apr 94 05:13:04 GMT
From: unix.sri.com!headwall.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!
paulf@hplabs.hp.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2p96nm$7k6@hebron.connected.com>,
<paulf.767130549@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>, <2pc1d8$qmk@ccnet.ccnet.com>(
Subject : Re: rec.radio.amateur.vhf.plus (?)

rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri) writes:

>Paul Flaherty (paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU) wrote:

>: I'll see if I can come up with some sort of automated listserver this

>: weekend, and set it up. If folks really want to set up a newsgroup, that's
>: okay too; I probably won't tie the two together.

>Please post to the newsgroups when you get this going.   Thanks

It's done and working. LISTSERV requests should go to:

vhf-request@w6yx.stanford.edu

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: 22 Apr 1994 02:02:10 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!bigfoot.wustl.edu!cec3!
jlw3@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2p1el9$m12@clarknet.clark.net>, <2p3egi$cbp@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>,
<2p721jktv1@rosebud.ncd.com>
Subject : Re: Illinois anti scanner legislation

Steve Wilson (stevew@sheridan.ncd.com) wrote:
: I understand everyone's concern... but last I heard is that there is a full
: federal pre-emption by FCC concerning this sort of thing for amateurs
: I suspect that it would be difficult to convince the cop on the beat
: that you are within your rights...and it might even take a court case
: to get it beaten into the state's head that the exemption exists... but it
: should be sufficient.

All the more reason to be an amateur, but the point is power of government
vs. people's rights, not so much whether *we* can tote our toys. Can they
really say that we cannot have things that can receive radio frequencies???
I'm glad I live in Missouri and Texas, and not Illinois!!!

--jesse

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #182
****